



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/688,587 | 10/18/2003 | Brian A. Hamman | QNX002 | 2256 |
| 7590 Arthur W. Fisher Patent Dominion Partnership, LP 6103 Twin Oaks Circle Dallas, TX 75240 | | | EXAMINER CHERVINSKY, BORIS LEO | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2835 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 11/30/2007 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,587

Applicant(s)

HAMMAN, BRIAN A.

Examiner

Boris L. Chervinsky

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 186-217 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 186-199 and 208-217 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 200-207 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 186, 188, 190, 193, 194, 196 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fox et al.

Fox discloses the cooling system for cooling heat-generating components in the data processing system having one or more processors 14 comprising: one or more heat transfer units 20 coupled to the heat-generating components 14 for receiving cooled coolant from a heat exchange unit 34 and generating heated coolant for transportation to the heat exchange unit 34; the heat exchange unit 34 remotely disposed from the heat transfer unit 20 and the heat generating components 14 for receiving heated coolant and generating cooled coolant; a forced circulation means 22 remotely disposed from the heat transfer unit 20 and the heat generating component 14 for forcing transporting at accelerated rates of cooled liquid coolant from the heat exchange unit 34 to the heat transfer unit 20 and for transporting heated coolant from the heat transfer unit 20 to the heat exchange unit 34; a liquid coolant pathway 24, 30, 38 for delivery of the cooled liquid coolant from the heat exchange unit 34 to the heat transfer unit 20 and for delivery of the heated liquid coolant from the heat transfer unit 20 to the heat exchange unit 34; and the cooling system has no component acting as a reservoir while

the cooling system is in operation; the heat exchange unit 34 has the inlet for receiving heated coolant from the heat transfer units and the outlet for receiving cooled coolant from the heat exchange unit 20 for transporting to the heat transfer unit 34, wherein the outlet is disposed below the inlet for enhancing convective circulation of the coolant (claim 188). The method steps of claims 194, 196 are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Fox et al.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 187, 191, 192, 195 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al.

With respect to claims 187 and 195, Fox discloses the claimed invention except positioning the inlet below the outlet. Several prior art references show such arrangement and since liquid circulation would be enhanced as well known convective circulation would be in effect it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to place the inlet below the outlet for that reason. With respect to claims 191 and 192, Fox discloses the claimed invention except the telecommunication system or optical device or the system with the at least one processor. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the system as disclosed by Fox et al. for a

telecommunication system or an optical device since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

5. Claim 189 and 197 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al. in view of Bingler.

Fox discloses the claimed invention except the heat transfer unit where the coolant has the direct contact with the heat-generating component. Bingler discloses the heat transfer unit having the cavity that is at least partially open to the external surface of the heat-generating component therefore the coolant is in direct contact with the component. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the heat transfer unit as disclosed by Bingler in the device disclosed by Fox for unimpeded heat transfer.

6. Claims 198, 199, 208-213, 214, 215, 217 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al. in view of Kang et al.

Fox discloses the claimed invention, as shown above for claim 186, except a heat exchange unit having an input and output cavity and a plurality of pathways. Kang discloses the cooling system having a heat exchange unit, the heat exchange unit comprising: an input cavity 2 for receiving heated coolant and distributing the heated coolant to the dissipater 4 having a plurality of pathways 3; the dissipater 4 is for receiving the heated coolant and cooling the coolant; an output cavity 6 for receiving the cooled coolant from the dissipater, and the cooling system has no component acting as

a reservoir while the cooling system is in operation, the input cavity disposed above the output cavity. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the heat exchange unit as disclosed by Kang in the structure disclosed by Fox for enhanced heat dissipation. With respect to claims 211 and 212, Fox discloses the claimed invention except the telecommunication system or optical device or the system with the at least one processor. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the system as disclosed by Fox et al. for a telecommunication system or an optical device since it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987). The method steps of claims 214 and 215 are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Fox and modified in view of Kang. With respect to claim 217, the method steps are necessitated by the device structure as disclosed by Fox and modified by Kang and obvious for the same consideration as was given for claims 187 and 195.

7. Claim 216 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fox et al. in view of Kang et al. and further in view of Bingler.

The method steps are necessitated by the device disclosed by Fox et al. except the heat transfer unit where the coolant has the direct contact with the heat-generating component. Bingler discloses the heat transfer unit having the cavity that is at least partially open to the external surface of the heat-generating component therefore the

coolant is in direct contact with the component. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to have the heat transfer unit as disclosed by Bingler in the device disclosed by Fox for unimpeded heat transfer.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 200-207 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris L. Chervinsky whose telephone number is 571-272-2039. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jayprakash N. Gandhi can be reached on 571-272-3740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Application/Control Number:
10/688,587
Art Unit: 2835

Page 7

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BORIS CHÉRVINSKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER


11/28/7